UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,656	12/06/2001	Cynthia Florence Dmochowski	DMOCHOWSKI-1-1-1-1	8740

27964 7590 06/25/2008

HITT GAINES P.C.
P.O. BOX 832570
RICHARDSON, TX 75083

EXAMINER	
LIU, I JUNG	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3694	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/25/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@hittgaines.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,656	DMOCHOWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARISSA LIU	3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 8-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 8-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-6 and 8-19 are presented for examination. Applicant filed an amendment on 12/19/2007 canceling claim 7 and amending claims 1, 8, 12 and 16. In view of Applicant's amendment, the Examiner withdraws the grounds of rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-19 based on 35 USC 101, 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103. However, new grounds of rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-19 necessitated by Applicant's amendment are established in the instant office action as set forth in detail below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the determined" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

3. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the determined" in claim 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the determined" in claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the determined" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. Claim 1,8, 16 recites the limitation "the online computer system". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the identification" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the identification" in claim 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the identification" in claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

10. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the identification" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

11. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the requisite" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

12. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the requisite" in claim 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

13. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the requisite" in claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

14. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the requisite" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

15. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the online system" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

16. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the online system" in claim 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

17. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the online system" in claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

18. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the online system" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

19. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the department" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

20. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the department" in claim 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

21. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the department" in claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

22. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the department" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

23. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the inputted" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

24. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the inputted" in claim 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

25. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the inputted" in claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

26. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the inputted" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

27. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the requisite" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

28. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the requisite" in claim 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

29. Claim 12 recites the limitation "the requisite" in claim 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

30. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the requisite" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

31. The term "defined number" in claim 1 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "defined number" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. For the purpose of the examination, the examiner interprets "defined number" as "number".

32. The term "defined number" in claim 8 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "defined number" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. For the purpose of the examination, the examiner interprets "defined number" as "number".

33. The term "defined number" in claim 12 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "defined number" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. For the purpose of the examination, the examiner interprets "defined number" as "number".

34. The term "defined number" in claim 16 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "defined number" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. For the purpose of the examination, the examiner interprets "defined number" as "number".

35. Claim 8 recites the limitation "the disapproval notification" in claim 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

36. Claim 16 recites the limitation "the disapproval notification" in claim 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Based on Supreme Court precedent and recent Federal circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under 101 and should be rejected as directed to non-statutory subject matter. (See Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); Cochrane v. Deener, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1976). The Supreme Court recognized that this test is not necessarily fixed or permanent and may evolve with technological advances. Gottschalk v. Benson, 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972).)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-6 and 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seltzer et al. (Reference B on the attached PTO-892) in view of Cummings, Jr., US Patent No. 5,301,105 (Reference A on the attached PTO-892), Warady et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,067,522 (Reference C on the attached PTO-892), and Narayanan et al., US Patent No. 2003/0046422 A1 (Reference D on the attached PTO-892) further in view of Official Notice.

3. As per claim 1, Seltzer et al. teaches a method for centralizing the capital expenditure approval process for expenditures by employees in the various departments of a company comprising the parts of each step of:

> b) determining factors which are to be considered as a prerequisite to an approval of a plurality of capital expenditures (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of "determining factors which are to be considered as a prerequisite to an approval of a plurality of capital expenditures").

d) creating a database for the online computer system which stores, the factors which are to be considered (column 1, lines 40-54, column 2, lines 48-53, column 4, lines 31-54, claim1);

e) inputting into the online system information about a desired capital expenditure which wants to incur the capital expenditure, and the factors (column5, lines 41-67, claim 15 and column 2, lines 48-54, where "input web pages for the insertion of updated partnership business data wherein at least one of the forms includes an add authorization of expenditure form, where the updated partnership business data is stored within said database" is equivalent of "inputting into the online system information about a desired capital expenditure which wants to incur the capital expenditure");

Seltzer et al. fails to teach the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company;

b) at least one capital expenditure sought by employees in each department;

c) using the determined factors to further determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure of the plurality of capital expenditures;

d) the identification of the departments, and the requisite levels of approvals;

e) including the department, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure, the desired capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures;

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital

expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals; and

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers.

Cummings, Jr. teaches the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company (see column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr., where "Identification 71 are made by designees such as authorized personnel within a company personnel department" is equivalent of "identifying a defined number of departments within the company");

d) the identification of the departments (see column 1, lines 20-29 and column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr.);

e) including the department (see column 4, lines 10-14 of Cummings, Jr.);

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification (see column 7, lines 41-47, 61-65 and column 8, lines 1-20 of Cummings, where "central processing system or a personal computer" is equivalent of "computer system");

Warady et al. teaches the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures sought by employees in each department (see column 5, lines 42-45 and column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "benefit table corresponding to a flexible spending account" is equivalent of "expenditures");

d) the requisite levels of approvals (see column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "prerequisites are required to provided by the employee for approval" is equivalent of "the requisite levels of approvals");

f) generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see column 5, lines 34-49, where "table corresponding to a flexible spending" is equivalent of "table for said expenditure");

Narayanan et al. teach the following step:

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers (see page 4-5, paragraph 0047, where "routing methods are systems disclosed herein can thus enable such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons" is equivalent of "electronically routing to each of the requisite approvers").

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification feature of Cummings, Jr. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27 of Cummings, Jr.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure feature of Warady et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure for the purpose of

obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using electronically routing the inputted information feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

Official Notice is taken that at least one capital expenditure, using factors to further determine a number of levels of approvals required for capital expenditure of plurality of capital expenditures, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of approval of capital expenditure, capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures, and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals is old and well known in corporate industry as a convenient way to for obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error or to make the capital

expenditure approval process more efficient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included at least one capital expenditure, using factors to further determine a number of levels of approvals required for capital expenditure of plurality of capital expenditures, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of approval of capital expenditure, capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures, and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals to the capital expenditure approval process.

4. As per claim 2, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. teach claim 1 described above. Cummings, Jr., further teaches the method wherein the step of identifying a defined number of departments includes the step of identifying all of the departments (see column 22, claim 56).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using identifying department feature of Cummings, Jr. into the combined method of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al.,, Official Notice and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate identifying department feature for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27).

5. As per claim 3, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. teach claim 1 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the factors which

must be considered are the nature of the item to be purchased and the cost of the item (see column 3, lines 28-36, where "operating expenses" is equivalent of "cost of the item").

6. As per claim 4, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. et al. teach claim 1 described above. Narayanan et al. further teaches the method wherein the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner (see page 2, paragraph 0023 and page 6, claim 16, where "subsequent object router" is equivalent of "routed in a sequential manner".)

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature of Narayanan et al. into the combined method of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al.,, Official Notice and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

7. As per claim 5, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. et al. teach claim 1 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the method is performed by a computer system (see column 1, lines 5-11, where "computer network-based system is equivalent of "computer system" of Seltzer et al.).

8. As per claim 6, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. et al. teach claim 1 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the method is incorporated into software (see column 2, lines 18-26, where "program" is equivalent of "software").

10. As per claim 8, Seltzer et al. teaches a method for centralizing a capital expenditure approval process for capital expenditures by employees in the various departments of a company comprising the parts of each step of:

b) determining factors which are to be considered as a prerequisite to an approval of a plurality of capital expenditures (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of "determining factors which are to be considered as a prerequisite to an approval of a plurality of capital expenditures").

d) creating a database for the online computer system which stores, the factors which are to be considered (column 1, lines 40-54, column 2, lines 48-53, column 4, lines 31-54, claim1);

e) inputting into the online system information about a desired capital expenditure which wants to incur the capital expenditure, and the factors (column5, lines 41-67, claim 15 and column 2, lines 48-54, where "input web pages for the insertion of updated partnership business data wherein at least one of the forms includes an add authorization of expenditure form, where the updated partnership business data is stored within said

database" is equivalent of "inputting into the online system information about a desired capital expenditure which wants to incur the capital expenditure");

Seltzer et al. fails to teach the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company;

b) at least one capital expenditure sought by employees in each department;

c) using the determined factors to further determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure of the plurality of capital expenditures;

d) the identification of the departments, and the requisite levels of approvals;

e) including the department, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure, the desired capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures;

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals; and

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers.

Cummings, Jr. teaches the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company (see column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr., where "Identification 71 are made by designees such as authorized personnel within a company personnel department" is equivalent of "identifying a defined number of departments within the company");

d) the identification of the departments (see column 1, lines 20-29 and column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr.);

e) including the department (see column 4, lines 10-14 of Cummings, Jr.);

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification (see column 7, lines 41-47, 61-65 and column 8, lines 1-20 of Cummings, where "central processing system or a personal computer" is equivalent of "computer system");

Warady et al. teaches the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures sought by employees in each department (see column 5, lines 42-45 and column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "benefit table corresponding to a flexible spending account" is equivalent of "expenditures");

d) the requisite levels of approvals (see column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "prerequisites are required to provided by the employee for approval" is equivalent of "the requisite levels of approvals");

f) generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see column 5, lines 34-49, where "table corresponding to a flexible spending" is equivalent of "table for said expenditure");

Narayanan et al. teach the following step:

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers (see page 4-5, paragraph 0047, where "routing methods are systems disclosed herein can thus enable such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons" is equivalent of "electronically routing to each of the requisite approvers").

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification feature of Cummings, Jr. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27 of Cummings, Jr.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure feature of Warady et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using electronically routing the inputted information feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or

systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

Official Notice is taken that at least one capital expenditure, using factors to further determine a number of levels of approvals required for capital expenditure of plurality of capital expenditures, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of approval of capital expenditure, capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures, and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals, generating an approval notification or a non-approval notification of the desired capital expenditure, and if the online computer system generates the disapproval notification: resubmitting into system, information and submit information is old and well known in corporate industry as a convenient way to for obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error or to make the capital expenditure approval process more efficient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included at least one capital expenditure, using factors to further determine a number of levels of approvals required for capital expenditure of plurality of capital expenditures, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of approval of capital expenditure, capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures, and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based

on at least the requisite number of approvals, generating an approval notification or a non-approval notification of the desired capital expenditure, and if the online computer system generates the disapproval notification: resubmitting into system, information and submit information to the capital expenditure approval process.

11. As per claim 9, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 8 described above. Cummings, Jr., further teaches the method wherein the step of identifying a defined number of departments includes the step of identifying all of the departments (see column 22, claim 56).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using identifying department feature of Cummings, Jr. into the combined method of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice, and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate identifying department feature for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27).

12. As per claim 10, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. teach claim 8 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the factors which must be considered are the nature of the item to be purchased and the cost of the item (see column 3, lines 28-36, where "operating expenses" is equivalent of "cost of the item").

13. As per claim 11, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. teach claim 8 described above. Narayanan et al. further teaches the method wherein the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner (see

page 2, paragraph 0023 and page 6, claim 16, where "subsequent object router" is equivalent of "routed in a sequential manner".)

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature of Narayanan et al. into the combined method of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.). of "table for said expenditure").

14. As per claim 12, Seltzer et al. teaches computer system for centralizing a capital expenditure approval process for capital expenditures by employees in the various departments of a company comprising one or more computers and computer readable code embodying instructions executable by the one or more computers, the computer system comprising computer readable code devices configured to cause the one or more computers to effect the of the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which are to be considered as a prerequisite to an approval of a plurality of capital expenditures (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure

within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of "determining factors which are to be considered as a prerequisite to an approval of a plurality of capital expenditures").

d) creating a database for the online computer system which stores, the factors which are to be considered (column 1, lines 40-54, column 2, lines 48-53, column 4, lines 31-54, claim1);

e) inputting into the online system information about a desired capital expenditure which wants to incur the capital expenditure, and the factors (column5, lines 41-67, claim 15 and column 2, lines 48-54, where "input web pages for the insertion of updated partnership business data wherein at least one of the forms includes an add authorization of expenditure form, where the updated partnership business data is stored within said database" is equivalent of "inputting into the online system information about a desired capital expenditure which wants to incur the capital expenditure");

Seltzer et al. fails to teach the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company;

b) at least one capital expenditure sought by employees in each department;

c) using the determined factors to further determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure of the plurality of capital expenditures;

d) the identification of the departments, and the requisite levels of approvals;

e) including the department, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure, the desired capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures;

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals; and

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers.

Cummings, Jr. teaches the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company (see column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr., where "Identification 71 are made by designees such as authorized personnel within a company personnel department" is equivalent of "identifying a defined number of departments within the company");

d) the identification of the departments (see column 1, lines 20-29 and column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr.);

e) including the department (see column 4, lines 10-14 of Cummings, Jr.);

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification (see column 7, lines 41-47, 61-65 and column 8, lines 1-20 of Cummings, where "central processing system or a personal computer" is equivalent of "computer system");

Warady et al. teaches the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures sought by employees in each department (see column 5, lines 42-45 and column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "benefit table corresponding to a flexible spending account" is equivalent of "expenditures");

d) the requisite levels of approvals (see column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "prerequisites are required to provided by the employee for approval" is equivalent of "the requisite levels of approvals");

f) generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see column 5, lines 34-49, where "table corresponding to a flexible spending" is equivalent of "table for said expenditure");

Narayanan et al. teach the following step:

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers (see page 4-5, paragraph 0047, where "routing methods are systems disclosed herein can thus enable such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons" is equivalent of "electronically routing to each of the requisite approvers").

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification feature of Cummings, Jr. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27 of Cummings, Jr.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure feature of Warady et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al . One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using electronically routing the inputted information feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

Official Notice is taken that at least one capital expenditure, using factors to further determine a number of levels of approvals required for capital expenditure of plurality of capital expenditures, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of approval of capital expenditure, capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures, and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based

on at least the requisite number of approvals is old and well known in corporate industry as a convenient way to for obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error or to make the capital expenditure approval process more efficient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included at least one capital expenditure, using factors to further determine a number of levels of approvals required for capital expenditure of plurality of capital expenditures, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of approval of capital expenditure, capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures, and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals to the capital expenditure approval process.

15. As per claim 13, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. teach claim 12 described above. Cummings, Jr., further teaches the system wherein the step of identifying a defined number of departments includes the step of identifying all of the departments (see column 22, claim 56).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using identifying department feature of Cummings, Jr. into the combined system of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate identifying department feature for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and

indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27).

16. As per claim 14, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. teach claim 12 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the factors which must be considered are the nature of the item to be purchased and the cost of the item (see column 3, lines 28-36, where "operating expenses" is equivalent of "cost of the item").

17. As per claim 15, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 12 described above. Narayanan et al. further teaches the system wherein the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner (see page 2, paragraph 0023 and page 6, claim 16, where "subsequent object router" is equivalent of "routed in a sequential manner".)

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature of Narayanan et al. into the combined method of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., Official Notice and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.). of "table for said expenditure").

18. As per claim 16, Cummings, Jr. teaches a computer data signal embodied in a transmission medium for centralizing the capital expenditure approval process for capital expenditures by employees in various departments of a company, the computer data signal comprising a code segment including instructions for

b) determining factors which are to be considered as a prerequisite to an approval of a plurality of capital expenditures (see column 3, lines 9-11, column 2, lines 46-53, and column 6, lines 45-61, claim 29, where "approve or disapprove of a proposed expenditure within the partnership based on the risk factor table" and "including key factors partners should be aware of, an authorization for expenditure" is equivalent of "determining factors which are to be considered as a prerequisite to an approval of a plurality of capital expenditures").

d) creating a database for the online computer system which stores, the factors which are to be considered (column 1, lines 40-54, column 2, lines 48-53, column 4, lines 31-54, claim1);

e) inputting into the online system information about a desired capital expenditure which wants to incur the capital expenditure, and the factors (column5, lines 41-67, claim 15 and column 2, lines 48-54, where "input web pages for the insertion of updated partnership business data wherein at least one of the forms includes an add authorization of expenditure form, where the updated partnership business data is stored within said database" is equivalent of "inputting into the online system information about a desired capital expenditure which wants to incur the capital expenditure");

Seltzer et al. fails to teach the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company;

b) at least one capital expenditure sought by employees in each department;

c) using the determined factors to further determine a defined number of levels of approvals required for each capital expenditure of the plurality of capital expenditures;

d) the identification of the departments, and the requisite levels of approvals;

e) including the department, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure, the desired capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures;

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals; and

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers.

Cummings, Jr. teaches the following parts of each step:

a) identifying a defined number of departments within the company (see column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr., where "Identification 71 are made by designees such as authorized personnel within a company personnel department" is equivalent of "identifying a defined number of departments within the company");

d) the identification of the departments (see column 1, lines 20-29 and column 8, lines 5-8 of Cummings, Jr.);

e) including the department (see column 4, lines 10-14 of Cummings, Jr.);

f) using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification (see column 7, lines 41-47, 61-65 and column 8, lines 1-20 of Cummings, where "central processing system or a personal computer" is equivalent of "computer system");

Warady et al. teaches the following parts of each step:

b) determining factors which must be considered as a prerequisite to the approval of capital expenditures sought by employees in each department (see column 5, lines 42-45 and column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "benefit table corresponding to a flexible spending account" is equivalent of "expenditures");

d) the requisite levels of approvals (see column 13, lines 8-13 of Warady, where "prerequisites are required to provided by the employee for approval" is equivalent of "the requisite levels of approvals");

f) generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure (see column 5, lines 34-49, where "table corresponding to a flexible spending" is equivalent of "table for said expenditure");

Narayanan et al. teach the following step:

g) electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers (see page 4-5, paragraph 0047, where "routing methods are systems disclosed herein can thus enable such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons" is equivalent of "electronically routing to each of the requisite approvers").

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification feature of Cummings, Jr. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would

have been motivated to incorporate using the online computer system to compare the inputted department identification for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27 of Cummings, Jr.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure feature of Warady et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate generating a table of requisite approvers for said expenditure for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate electronically routing the inputted information to each of the requisite approvers feature of Narayanan et al. into the method of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate using electronically routing the inputted information feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

Official Notice is taken that at least one capital expenditure, using factors to further determine a number of levels of approvals required for capital expenditure of plurality of capital

expenditures, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of approval of capital expenditure, capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures, and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals, generating an approval notification or a non-approval notification of the desired capital expenditure, and if the online computer system generates the disapproval notification: resubmitting into system, information and submit information is old and well known in corporate industry as a convenient way to for obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error or to make the capital expenditure approval process more efficient. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included at least one capital expenditure, using factors to further determine a number of levels of approvals required for capital expenditure of plurality of capital expenditures, which are to be considered as a prerequisite of approval of capital expenditure, capital expenditure being one of the plurality of the capital expenditures, and the factors which are to be considered as the prerequisite of the approval of the desired capital expenditure with the database and generating a table of requisite approvers for the desired capital expenditure based on at least the requisite number of approvals, generating an approval notification or a non-approval notification of the desired capital expenditure, and if the online computer system generates the disapproval notification: resubmitting into system, information and submit information to the capital expenditure approval process.

19. As per claim 17, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 16 described above. Cummings, Jr., further teaches the computer data signal wherein the instructions for identifying a defined number of departments includes the instructions of identifying all of the departments (see column 22, claim 56 of Cummings and column 9 and lines 45-58 of Warady et al.).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate using identifying department feature of Cummings, Jr. into the combined system of Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate identifying department feature for the purpose of providing integrated service, because the feature reduces time, direct cost and indirect cost often incurred through duplication of tests, excessive paperwork (see column 2, lines 22-27).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the instructions feature of Warady et al. into the computer data signal of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the instructions for the purpose of obviating one or more of the problems due to limitations, i.e. wasted time and human error by an employee providing inconsistent information, and disadvantages of the related art, because standardized forms reduce the human error (see column 2, lines 24-53 of Warady).

20. As per claim 18, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 16 described above. Seltzer et al. further teaches the factors which must be considered are the nature of the item to be purchased and the cost of the item (see column 3, lines 28-36, where "operating expenses" is equivalent of "cost of the item").

21. As per claim 19, Seltzer et al., Cummings, Jr., Warady et al., and Narayanan et al. teach claim 16 described above. Narayanan et al. further teaches the computer data signal wherein the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner (see page 2, paragraph 0023 and page 6, claim 16, where "subsequent object router" is equivalent of "routed in a sequential manner".)

It would also be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature of Narayanan et al. into the computer data signal of Seltzer et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the inputted information is routed to the requisite approvers in a sequential manner feature for the purpose of permitting to construct the object y dynamically downloading the associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source, because it enables such approval processes to be automated across a network of approving persons or systems by associating the routing slip and the approval conditions with the document (see abstract and pages 4-5, paragraph 0047 of Narayanan et al.).

Response to Arguments

37. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 8-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

38. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARISSA LIU whose telephone number is (571)270-1370. The examiner can normally be reached on IFP.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 3694

/James P Trammell/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3694